





APPLICATION NO.		LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/811,231	0	3/16/2001	Philip R. Thrift	T1-20205.1	3125	
23494	7590	05/20/2002				
		ENTS INCORPO	EXAMINER			
P O BOX 655 DALLAS, TX	,	3999		CHAWAN, VIJAY B		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2654		
				DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002	DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

		ON
Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/811,231	HRIFT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vijay B. Chawan	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

conditi	ion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued ination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
a) [>	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) [	
have been 37 CFR (b) above	tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee en filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in re, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any potent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b)	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE:
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.🖂	The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
	Claim(s) allowed:
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: 20-36.
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) _ approved or b) _ disapproved by the Examiner.
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10.	Other:  Vijay B. Chawan Primary Examiner  Art Unit: 2654

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are not deemed persuasive. The final rejection is still deemed appropriate. Applicant argues that eventhough Houser provides subscriber access to the Internet, He does not show how. Neither does the Applicant's claimed subject matter..